

Coherence turned on by incoherent light

Vyacheslav N. Shatokhin,¹ Mattia Walschaers,^{1,2} Frank Schlawin,^{1,3} and Andreas Buchleitner¹

¹*Physikalisches Institut, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg,
Hermann-Herder-Str. 3, D-79104 Freiburg, Germany*

²*Instituut voor Theoretische Fysica, KU Leuven,
Celestijnenlaan 200D, B-3001 Heverlee, Belgium*

³*Clarendon Laboratory, University of Oxford, Parks Road, Oxford OX1 3PU, United Kingdom*

(Dated: March 7, 2016)

We consider an open quantum system composed of two dipole-dipole interacting two-level atoms and show that incoherent excitation can trigger coherent dynamics in this toy “molecular aggregate”. We show that the retarded dipole-dipole interaction creates coherence regardless of the coherence properties of the excitation fields. In contrast to earlier claims in the literature, our rigorous analysis shows that the steady state coherence *increases* with the energy gradient between the two-level atoms.

Introduction.— A detailed understanding of the microscopic processes which underlie natural photosynthesis represents an important and intriguing source of inspiration for technologies which seek to efficiently capture, transform, and store solar energy [1, 2]. One of the most important open questions in this research area is whether quantum interference effects could play a role in solar light harvesting, and possibly be the source for the high efficiency of the energy conversion. That transient quantum coherence can prevail in such complex structures, at ambient temperatures, can by now be regarded a solidly established experimental fact [3, 4], and has also been reported in the charge separation process in organic solar cells [5, 6].

It however has been argued [7] that the evidence provided by the above experiments is inconclusive, because the conditions under which quantum effects were experimentally observed in certain light harvesting complexes (LHC) differ from conditions in vivo. Indeed, laboratory experiments rely on photon echo spectroscopy [8], where the energy transfer is induced by a series of ultrashort coherent laser pulses. In contrast, sunlight (driving the natural process) can be described as continuous wave (or stationary) thermal (incoherent) radiation [9]. Thus, it is a priori crucial to distinguish the coherence observed in photon echoes [10] from coherence which may arise in non-equilibrium open system quantum dynamics – as we will outline below.

Moreover, it is argued in [7, 11, 12] that the coupling of a quantum system to a thermal radiation bath rapidly leads to a formation of a stationary state in the system that does not exhibit any dynamical coherences. This apparently contradicts the point of view that what matters in the efficient energy transport in certain LHC is what has been called their *intrinsic* quantum coherence, which can be triggered by any photoabsorption event, regardless of the source of photons [13, 14]. This intrinsic coherence could stem from different scenarios: resonant coupling to vibrational modes [10, 15–18], or to a single light mode [19], as well as Fano-type resonances with the

electromagnetic continuum [20].

The aim of our present contribution is to shed some further light on this controversial issue. To begin with, we recall that the primary process of photosynthesis is the absorption of a single photon by a chlorophyll molecule, whereby the molecule undergoes a transition from the ground to the excited electronic state [2]. The photoabsorption event can then launch energy transfer towards the reaction center, where it triggers a charge separation cascade with almost unit efficiency [21]. The latter process has a finite duration, of the order of a picosecond, and it is at this stage that electronic coherences have been observed [3, 4, 22]. After the excited state energy is transformed, the molecule resets in its ground electronic state and is able to absorb the next photon.

Since any LHC can be thought of as a photodetector designed by nature, it is instructive to draw an analogy between the operation of an LHC and that of a man-made broadband single-photon detector used in quantum optics [23, 24]. Such a detector’s sensitivity is non-vanishing for a range of frequencies $\Delta\omega$. When a photon with frequency ω within the sensitivity range hits the detector, the latter may produce a click – a *transient* electric response – whose duration is defined by the inverse of $\Delta\omega$. In photon counting experiments, different sources of light will produce different statistics of the detector clicks [24]. But each separate click is triggered by the transfer of the elementary excitation from a mode of the electromagnetic field to the detector. Should quantum coherent processes accompany the excitation transfer, they must be completely independent of the light source. Consequently, an absorption of a photon from not only a coherent laser source but also from an incoherent thermal source will be accompanied by transient coherent evolution – for natural and artificial photon detectors alike – provided that it is *intrinsic* to the detection process.

The above analogy suggests to present an example of a system with intrinsic electronic coherences which come into play even when the system is excited by an incoherent light source. To this end, we consider a simple quan-




FIG. 1. Two molecules with transition frequencies ω_1 and ω_2 that are detuned from each other by $\Delta = \omega_1 - \omega_2$ are embedded into a common electromagnetic bath. The bath induces radiative decay of the molecules (γ_k is the decay rate of atom k) as well as dipole-dipole interaction with complex coupling constant T_{12} [see Eq. (2)]. An external incoherent thermal source induces processes of absorption and stimulated emission.

tum optical toy model of a “molecular aggregate” which consists of two two-level atoms, which we shall refer to as molecules in the following, that are located in the near field of each other and embedded into a common electromagnetic bath. Thereby, we abstract ourselves from the details of the structure and energy spectra of a real photosynthetic complex [2]. Due to the dipole-dipole interaction between the molecules that is mediated by the bath, this system’s Hamiltonian generates intrinsic quantum coherences in the sense of [13]. We study the interaction of this system with an external incoherent field which emulates the sunlight, and show that the system exhibits a transient coherent evolution.

Model.— Our model is presented in Fig. 1. It consists of two molecules embedded into a common radiation bath and interacting with an external incoherent radiation field in the optical frequency range. We assume that the molecules have distinct dipole matrix elements, $d_1 \neq d_2$, and that their optical transition frequencies ω_1 and ω_2 are detuned by $\Delta = \omega_1 - \omega_2$, which obeys the inequality $\Delta \ll \omega_1, \omega_2$. Furthermore, we can ignore the ambient thermal photons (since $\hbar\omega/k_B \sim 6000$ K at optical frequencies) and assume the radiation reservoir in the vacuum state. This bath induces spontaneous decay of

the molecules with rates γ_k , as well as their dipole-dipole interaction with complex coupling strength T_{12} . As for the external incoherent field, we assume that its energy density is a slowly varying function around the transition frequency. The external field generates absorption and stimulated emission processes at the rate $\gamma_k N(\omega_1)$ [25], where $N(\omega_1)$ is the average number of the (incoherent) source photons at the transition frequency which is defined by the source temperature.

We denote the ground and excited electronic states of molecules k ($k = 1, 2$) by $|1\rangle_k$ and $|2\rangle_k$, respectively, and assume that initially the molecules are in their ground states. Using standard quantum optical methods [26], one can trace over the bath degrees of freedom, and arrive at the master equation governing the evolution of the expectation value of an arbitrary “aggregate” operator Q . This operator is taken from the complete basis set of operators $Q \in \{\vec{q}_1 \otimes \vec{q}_2\}$, with

$$\vec{q}_k = (\mathbb{1}^k, \sigma_-^k, \sigma_+^k, \sigma_z^k),$$

$$\mathbb{1}^k = \sigma_+^k \sigma_-^k + \sigma_-^k \sigma_+^k, \quad \sigma_z^k = \sigma_+^k \sigma_-^k - \sigma_-^k \sigma_+^k,$$

where $\sigma_-^k = |1\rangle_k \langle 2|_k$ and $\sigma_+^k = |2\rangle_k \langle 1|_k$. In the frame rotating at the frequency $\omega_0 = (\omega_1 + \omega_2)/2$, the master equation reads

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \dot{Q} \rangle = & \left\langle \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{i\Delta}{2} (-1)^{k-1} [\sigma_+^k \sigma_-^k, Q] \right. \\ & + \gamma_k N(\omega_k) ([\sigma_-^k, Q] \sigma_+^k + \sigma_-^k [Q, \sigma_+^k]) \\ & + \gamma_k \{1 + N(\omega_k)\} ([\sigma_+^k, Q] \sigma_-^k + \sigma_+^k [Q, \sigma_-^k]) \\ & \left. + \sum_{k \neq l=1}^2 (T_{kl} [\sigma_+^k, Q] \sigma_-^l + T_{lk}^* \sigma_+^l [Q, \sigma_-^k]) \right\rangle, \quad (1) \end{aligned}$$

where $\langle \dots \rangle$ denotes the quantum-mechanical average over the initial molecule-bath system, $\gamma_k = d_k^2 \omega_k^3 / 6\pi\epsilon_0 \hbar c^3$, and $T_{12} = T_{21} = \Gamma(\omega_0 r_{12}/c) + i\Omega(\omega_0 r_{12}/c)$ is the *retarded* dipole-dipole interaction strength. The real part of T_{12} mediates (collective) radiative decay processes, whereas its imaginary part describes the non-radiative excitation exchange between the two molecules [20, 27–29]. Accordingly, $\Gamma(\omega_0 r_{12}/c)$ and $\Omega(\omega_0 r_{12}/c)$ are associated with different lifetimes and energy level shifts of eigenstates of the coupled two-molecule system, respectively. Thus, the retarded dipole-dipole interaction constant describes collective effects and is in particular important for understanding super-radiance and entanglement in the Dicke

model [28, 30]. Explicitly [27, 31],

$$\Gamma(\xi) \equiv \frac{3\sqrt{\gamma_1\gamma_2}}{2} \left\{ [\hat{\mathbf{d}}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{d}}_2 - (\hat{\mathbf{d}}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{12})(\hat{\mathbf{d}}_2 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{12})] \frac{\sin \xi}{\xi} + [\hat{\mathbf{d}}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{d}}_2 - 3(\hat{\mathbf{d}}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{12})(\hat{\mathbf{d}}_2 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{12})] \times \left(\frac{\cos \xi}{\xi^2} - \frac{\sin \xi}{\xi^3} \right) \right\}, \quad (2a)$$

$$\Omega(\xi) \equiv \frac{3\sqrt{\gamma_1\gamma_2}}{2} \left\{ -[\hat{\mathbf{d}}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{d}}_2 - (\hat{\mathbf{d}}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{12})(\hat{\mathbf{d}}_2 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{12})] \frac{\cos \xi}{\xi} + [\hat{\mathbf{d}}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{d}}_2 - 3(\hat{\mathbf{d}}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{12})(\hat{\mathbf{d}}_2 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{12})] \times \left(\frac{\sin \xi}{\xi^2} + \frac{\cos \xi}{\xi^3} \right) \right\}, \quad (2b)$$

where $\xi \equiv \omega_0 r_{12}/c$ is the effective intermolecular distance [32], and $\hat{\mathbf{d}}_k$ and $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{12}$ are unit vectors directed along the k th molecular dipole and along the vector connecting the molecules, respectively.

The presence of terms proportional to $\Omega(\xi)$ in (1) is a manifestation of the intrinsic dipole-dipole interaction-mediated coherence in our model. This becomes transparent in the non-retarded limit $c \rightarrow \infty$, where $\Omega(\xi) \rightarrow V_{dd}/\hbar$, with V_{dd} the static dipole-dipole interaction energy [27]:

$$V_{dd} = \frac{\mathbf{d}_1 \cdot \mathbf{d}_2 - 3(\mathbf{d}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{12})(\mathbf{d}_2 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{12})}{4\pi\epsilon_0 r_{12}^3}, \quad (3)$$

which transforms the last line of Eq. (1) into an effective Hamiltonian term, $i\langle[H_{dd}, Q]\rangle$, with

$$H_{dd} = V_{dd}(\sigma_+^1 \sigma_-^2 + \sigma_+^2 \sigma_-^1). \quad (4)$$

This non-retarded treatment of the dipole-dipole interaction represents the standard treatment in chemical physics [33]. However, in this limit, with the retardation effects completely ignored, the decay rates γ_1 , γ_2 , and $\Gamma(\xi)$ equal zero [34]. To avoid this problem, some phenomenological treatments [35] use the static form of the dipole-dipole interaction, that is, $\Omega(\xi) \rightarrow V_{dd}/\hbar$ and $\Gamma(\xi) \rightarrow 0$, while keeping γ_1 , γ_2 finite. Additionally, the coupling to other, e.g. vibrational, degrees of freedom may cause further dissipation [13, 36]. As we show below, a consequence of this inconsistency is that the stationary electronic coherence in the dipole-interacting system is erroneously predicted to vanish.

Let us therefore inspect the time-dependent expectation value $\text{Im}\{\langle\sigma_+^2(t)\sigma_-^1(t)\rangle\}$ as the quantifier of the electronic inter-site coherence of our “molecular aggregate”. Upon multiplication by $2\Omega(\xi)$ it yields the *excitation current*, which is proportional to the probability per unit time of excitation transfer from molecule 1 to molecule 2 (see Appendix). For simplicity and without loss of the essential physics, we study the temporal behavior of the coherence under the assumptions that both dipoles point in

the same direction and that the excited state of molecule 1 has slightly larger natural linewidth than molecule 2: $\gamma_2 = 0.9\gamma_1$. In a fully symmetric system, where $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2$ and $\Delta = 0$, the expectation value of the excitation current vanishes for all times, $\text{Im}\{\langle\sigma_+^2(t)\sigma_-^1(t)\rangle\} \equiv 0$.

Our results on the temporal evolution of $\text{Im}\{\langle\sigma_+^2(t)\sigma_-^1(t)\rangle\}$ are plotted in Fig. 2(a)-(d), where we vary, respectively, the mean photon number $N(\omega_1) = N(\omega_2) = N(\omega_0)$, the detuning Δ , the orientation $\mathbf{f} = (\hat{\mathbf{d}}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{12})$, and the distance ξ , while keeping the other three parameters fixed. It is evident that non-zero coherence is a generic feature of the intramolecular excitation transfer that follows the photo-absorption process at $t = 0$ by the molecule being initially in its ground (reset) state. In the transient regime, $\text{Im}\{\langle\sigma_+^2(t)\sigma_-^1(t)\rangle\}$ exhibits decaying oscillations which correspond to the excitation bouncing back and forth between the molecules. The frequency and the decay rate of these oscillations are given by $[\Delta^2 + 4\Omega(\xi)^2]^{1/2}$ and by a constant $\sim \gamma_1$ (which can be associated with the molecule’s sensitivity range, $\gamma_1 \sim \Delta\omega$), respectively. On top of the decaying oscillations, there is a slow relaxation, at a rate $\sim N(\omega_0)\gamma_1$, to the non-equilibrium steady state. The analytical solution for the steady state reads (see Appendix)

$$\text{Im}\{\langle\sigma_+^2\sigma_-^1\rangle\} = \frac{2N\Gamma[(1+2N)\gamma_1\gamma_2\Delta + (\gamma_2 - \gamma_1)\Gamma\Omega]}{R}, \quad (5)$$

where $N \equiv N(\omega_0)$, $\Gamma \equiv \Gamma(\xi)$, $\Omega \equiv \Omega(\xi)$, and the expression for R is given in (20). Equation (5) shows that the stationary excitation current *only* emerges in the regime of the *retarded* (that is, $\Gamma \neq 0$) dipole-dipole interaction. This is related to the fact that finite Γ gives rise to different decay rates associated with the eigenstates of the dipole-dipole interacting system [28] which amounts to the irreversibility of the excitation exchange processes. As a result, the stationary populations of the excited levels of the two molecules become unequal. The latter is crucial for the emergence of the stationary current. Indeed, using Eqs. (5) and (19) we establish an identity that is valid in the case $\gamma = \gamma_1 = \gamma_2$ (while $\Delta \neq 0$):

$$2\Omega \text{Im}\{\langle\sigma_+^2\sigma_-^1\rangle\} = \gamma(1+2N)\{\langle\sigma_+^2\sigma_-^2\rangle - \langle\sigma_+^1\sigma_-^1\rangle\}. \quad (6)$$

This result can be interpreted as an energy balance relation for our dipole-dipole coupled system. The left hand side of (6) yields the number of photons that is transferred per unit time from molecule 1 to molecule 2; the right hand side yields the difference between the total number of photons that are emitted due to spontaneous and stimulated emission or absorbed per unit time by molecule 2 and by molecule 1.

Equation (6) is reminiscent of a relation well known in single atom resonance fluorescence [23]: There, quantum coherence between the atomic ground and excited states arises due to the presence of the laser field, characterized by the Rabi frequency. The quantity describing the




FIG. 2. Dynamics of electronic coherence, $\text{Im}\{\langle \sigma_+^2(t) \sigma_-^1(t) \rangle\}$, as a function of $\gamma_1 t$, upon variation of the following parameters (note the different scaling of the y -axes): (a) mean photon number, $N(\omega_0)$ (for an example transition wave length of 460 nm the mean photon numbers $N(\omega_0) = 0.01, 0.05, 0.1$ correspond to the incoherent source temperatures $T \approx 6760, 10250, 13000$ K, respectively), at $\xi = 0.1$, $f = 0$ [$f \equiv (\hat{\mathbf{d}}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{12}) = (\hat{\mathbf{d}}_2 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{12})$], $\Delta = 300\gamma_1$; (b) detuning, Δ , at $\xi = 0.1$, $f = 0$, $N(\omega_0) = 0.1$; (c) orientation, f , at $\xi = 0.1$, $N(\omega_0) = 0.1$, $\Delta = 300\gamma_1$; (d) distance, ξ (in units of c/ω_0), at $N(\omega_0) = 0.1$, $\Delta = 300\gamma_1$, $f = 0$.

molecular coherence, $\text{Im}\{\langle \sigma_+ \rangle\}$, is coupled to the molecular excited state population, such that a single molecule energy balance relation similar to (6) holds. In the case of two molecules, quantum coherence between the molecular dipoles arises due to the dipole-dipole interaction, which plays the role of the Rabi frequency [37]. The directed excitation current leads to an imbalance of the molecular excited state populations: the molecule with larger transition frequency has smaller excited state population because part of it is coherently transferred to the molecule with smaller transition frequency.

The steady-state flux does not exhibit any oscillations. This is an indication of the directionality of the average current, which undergoes the following cycle: For $\Delta > 0$ (see Fig. 1) thermal photons are absorbed mainly by molecule 1 and, after the excitation transfer to molecule 2, they are emitted therefrom. This behavior is consistent with our intuitive picture of a real-time evolution of the current in our “molecular aggregate”, prepared initially in its ground state, and whose interaction with the incoherent pump is turned on at $t = 0$. The real-time current

will exhibit a sequence of transient oscillations with a duration $\sim \gamma^{-1}$. Each of these bursts of the current are a manifestation of the photo-absorption events that occur randomly in time, whereas the decay of the current is a manifestation of the reset of the molecule in its ground state. Upon averaging the evolution of the system that covers time scales much longer than molecule’s response time $\sim \gamma^{-1}$ we will obtain the current undergoing the aforementioned cycle.

Conclusion.— We have studied the dynamics of the electronic coherence of a toy “molecular aggregate” composed of two closely located two-level atoms coupled to a vacuum reservoir and excited by an incoherent field. We have shown that the transient behavior of this function exhibits coherent oscillations. The frequency and decay rate of these oscillations are defined by the dipole-dipole interaction strength and the relaxation rate, which is of the order of the natural line width of the excited states. The coherence emerges as a consequence of the retarded dipole-dipole interaction between the molecules. In the non-retarded limit, this interaction assumes the usual

Hamiltonian form (3), which is typically employed in the literature [33]. In this picture, the incoherent excitation creates an incoherent mixture of eigenstates *instantaneously*, and transient dynamics are neglected. Thus, in contrast to the results of [7], our results establish a realistic scenario where intermolecular electronic coherence can be triggered by the absorption of the incoherent light. It still remains to be shown whether this coherence can be beneficial for the functionality of photosynthetic complexes.

The authors are grateful to Graham Fleming and Greg Scholes for stimulating discussions. A.B. and V.N.S. acknowledge support through the EU Collaborative project QuProCS (Grant Agreement 641277). M.W. would like to thank the German National Academic Foundation for financial support.

Appendix: Solution of the master equation (1)

Inserting operators from the basis set into Eq. (1), we obtain a closed linear system of 15 equations of motion for the expectation values of the vector $\langle \vec{Q} \rangle$:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \vec{Q} \rangle = & (\langle \sigma_-^1 \rangle, \langle \sigma_+^1 \rangle, \langle \sigma_z^1 \rangle, \langle \sigma_-^2 \rangle, \langle \sigma_+^2 \rangle, \langle \sigma_z^2 \rangle, \langle \sigma_-^1 \sigma_-^2 \rangle, \\ & \langle \sigma_-^1 \sigma_+^2 \rangle, \langle \sigma_-^1 \sigma_z^2 \rangle, \langle \sigma_+^1 \sigma_-^2 \rangle, \langle \sigma_+^1 \sigma_+^2 \rangle, \langle \sigma_+^1 \sigma_z^2 \rangle, \\ & \langle \sigma_z^1 \sigma_-^2 \rangle, \langle \sigma_z^1 \sigma_+^2 \rangle, \langle \sigma_z^1 \sigma_z^2 \rangle)^T. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

The resulting system splits into four uncoupled subsystems. For reference, all entries of the vector $\langle \vec{Q} \rangle$ are listed below according to their subsystems:

- (i) $\langle \sigma_-^1 \sigma_-^2 \rangle, \langle \sigma_+^1 \sigma_+^2 \rangle,$
- (ii) $\langle \sigma_-^1 \rangle, \langle \sigma_-^2 \rangle, \langle \sigma_-^1 \sigma_z^2 \rangle, \langle \sigma_z^1 \sigma_-^2 \rangle,$
- (iii) $\langle \sigma_+^1 \rangle, \langle \sigma_+^2 \rangle, \langle \sigma_+^1 \sigma_z^2 \rangle, \langle \sigma_z^1 \sigma_+^2 \rangle,$
- (iv) $\langle \sigma_z^1 \rangle, \langle \sigma_z^2 \rangle, \langle \sigma_+^2 \sigma_-^1 \rangle, \langle \sigma_+^1 \sigma_-^2 \rangle, \langle \sigma_z^1 \sigma_z^2 \rangle.$

The variables that are relevant to us are contained in group (iv). Indeed, the excitation current can be expressed as a difference between the number of excitations transferred per unit time from molecule 1 to molecule 2 minus the number of excitations that are transferred in the opposite direction, i.e. it is proportional to the two-molecule coherence function,

$$\frac{1}{2i}(\langle \sigma_+^2 \sigma_-^1 \rangle - \langle \sigma_+^1 \sigma_-^2 \rangle) = \text{Im} \{ \langle \sigma_+^2 \sigma_-^1 \rangle \}. \quad (9)$$

The latter quantity can be found from solutions of the following equation of motion:

$$\dot{\vec{x}} = A\vec{x} + \vec{L}, \quad (10)$$

with $\vec{x} = (\langle \sigma_z^1 \rangle, \langle \sigma_z^2 \rangle, \langle \sigma_+^2 \sigma_-^1 \rangle, \langle \sigma_+^1 \sigma_-^2 \rangle, \langle \sigma_z^1 \sigma_z^2 \rangle)^T$,

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} -\kappa_1 & 0 & -2T^* & -2T & 0 \\ 0 & -\kappa_2 & -2T & -2T^* & 0 \\ \frac{T}{2} & \frac{T^*}{2} & -\frac{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2}{2} - i\Delta & 0 & \Gamma \\ \frac{T^*}{2} & \frac{T}{2} & 0 & -\frac{\kappa_1 + \kappa_2}{2} + i\Delta & \Gamma \\ -2\gamma_2 & -2\gamma_1 & 4\Gamma & 4\Gamma & -\kappa_1 - \kappa_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (11)$$

$$\vec{L} = (-2\gamma_1, -2\gamma_2, 0, 0, 0)^T, \quad (12)$$

where $\kappa_i = 2\gamma_i\{1 + 2N(\omega_0)\}$, and $T = \Gamma + i\Omega$, with $\Gamma \equiv \Gamma(\xi)$, $\Omega \equiv \Omega(\xi)$ given by (2a) and (2b), respectively [38]. We assume that at time $t = 0$ both molecules are in their ground states, hence the vector of initial conditions is

$$\vec{x}(0) = (-1, -1, 0, 0, 1)^T. \quad (13)$$

The formal time dependent solution of Eq. (10) reads

$$\vec{x}(t) = e^{At}\vec{x}(0) + (e^{At} - \mathbb{1})A^{-1}\vec{L}. \quad (14)$$

While for arbitrary times, the temporal behavior of $\vec{x}(t)$ can be studied numerically, in the steady state limit, analytical solutions $\vec{x}(\infty) = -A^{-1}\vec{L}$ are readily available.

First, let us consider the steady state solutions for $\Gamma = 0$. In this case, the entries of the vector $\vec{x}(\infty)$ read:

$$\langle \sigma_z^1 \rangle = \langle \sigma_z^2 \rangle = -\frac{1}{1 + 2N}, \quad (15)$$

$$\langle \sigma_+^2 \sigma_-^1 \rangle = \langle \sigma_+^1 \sigma_-^2 \rangle = 0, \quad (16)$$

$$\langle \sigma_z^1 \sigma_z^2 \rangle = \langle \sigma_z^1 \rangle \langle \sigma_z^2 \rangle, \quad (17)$$

where $N \equiv N(\omega_0)$. The above solutions indicate equal population distributions of both molecules and absence of intermolecular electronic coherence.

In contrast, at $\Gamma \neq 0$, we obtain $\langle \sigma_z^1 \rangle \neq \langle \sigma_z^2 \rangle$ and a non-trivial two-molecule coherence in the two-level system. Below we present the explicit expressions for two quantities: the excitation current, $\text{Im} \{ \langle \sigma_+^2 \sigma_-^1 \rangle \}$, and the difference between the excited state populations of two molecules, $\langle \sigma_+^2 \sigma_-^2 \rangle - \langle \sigma_+^1 \sigma_-^1 \rangle = (\langle \sigma_z^2 \rangle - \langle \sigma_z^1 \rangle)/2$:

$$\text{Im} \{ \langle \sigma_-^1 \sigma_+^2 \rangle \} = \frac{2N\Gamma[(1+2N)\gamma_1\gamma_2\Delta + (\gamma_2 - \gamma_1)\Gamma\Omega]}{R}, \quad (18)$$

$$\langle \sigma_+^2 \sigma_-^2 \rangle - \langle \sigma_+^1 \sigma_-^1 \rangle = \frac{2N\Gamma(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2)[\Delta\Omega + (\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)(1+2N)\Gamma]}{R}, \quad (19)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} R = & 2(1+2N)(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1)\Delta\Gamma\Omega + \Gamma^2[(1+2N)^2 \\ & \times \{2N(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)^2 - (\gamma_1 + \gamma_2)^2\} - 4\Omega^2] \\ & + (1+2N)^3[\gamma_1\gamma_2\{(1+2N)^2(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2)^2 + \Delta^2\} \\ & + (\gamma_1 + \gamma_2)^2\Omega^2]. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

A direct inspection of Eqs. (18) and (19) at $\gamma = \gamma_1 = \gamma_2$ yields an energy balance relation (6).

-
- [1] G. D. Scholes, G. R. Fleming, A. Olaya-Castro, and R. van Grondelle, *Nat. Chem.* **3**, 763 (2011).
 - [2] R. E. Blankenship, *Molecular mechanisms of photosynthesis* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002).
 - [3] T. Brixner *et al.*, *Nature* **434**, 625 (2005).
 - [4] G. S. Engel *et al.*, *Nature* **446**, 782 (2007).
 - [5] C. Andrea Rozzi *et al.*, *Nat. Commun.* **4**, 1602 (2013).
 - [6] S. M. Falke *et al.*, *Science* **344**, 1001 (2014).
 - [7] P. Brumer and M. Shapiro, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA* **109**, 19575 (2012).
 - [8] S. Mukamel, *Principles of nonlinear optical spectroscopy* (Oxford University Press, New York, 1999).
 - [9] L. Mandel and E. Wolf, *Optical Coherence and Quantum Optics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1995).
 - [10] N. Christensson, H. F. Kauffmann, T. Pullerits, and T. Mančal, *J. Phys. Chem. B* **116**, 7449 (2012).
 - [11] L. A. Pachón and P. Brumer, *Phys. Rev. A* **87**, 022106 (2013).
 - [12] T. Mančal and L. Valkunas, *New J. Phys.* **12**, 065044 (2010).
 - [13] Y.-C. Cheng and G. R. Fleming, *Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem.* **60**, 241 (2009).
 - [14] A. Ishizaki and G. R. Fleming, *Annu. Rev. Condens. Matter Phys.* **3**, 333 (2012).
 - [15] A. W. Chin *et al.*, *Nat. Phys.* **9**, 113 (2013).
 - [16] E. J. O'Reilly and A. Olaya-Castro, *Nat. Commun.* **5**, 3012 (2014).
 - [17] F. D. Fuller *et al.*, *Nat. Chem.* **6**, 706 (2014).
 - [18] E. Romero *et al.*, *Nat. Phys.* **10**, 676 (2014).
 - [19] D. Avisar, A. Eilam, and A. D. Wilson-Gordon, arXiv:1504.05848 [quant-ph] (2015).
 - [20] K. E. Dorfman, D. V. Voronine, S. Mukamel, and M. O. Scully, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA* **110**, 2746 (2013).
 - [21] J. Strümpfer, M. Şener, and K. Schulten, *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.* **3**, 536 (2012).
 - [22] E. Collini *et al.*, *Nature* **463**, 644 (2010).
 - [23] C. Cohen-Tannoudji, J. Dupont-Roc, and G. Grynberg, *Atom-Photon Interactions* (Wiley, New York, 1992).
 - [24] R. J. Glauber, *Quantum theory of optical coherence* (WILEY-VCH Verlag, Weinheim, 2007).
 - [25] R. Loudon, *The Quantum Theory of Light*, 3rd ed. (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004).
 - [26] M. O. Scully and M. S. Zubairy, *Quantum optics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1997).
 - [27] G. S. Agarwal, *Quantum Statistical Theories of Spontaneous Emission and their Relation to other Approaches* (Springer, Berlin, 1974).
 - [28] M. Gross and S. Haroche, *Phys. Rep.* **93**, 301 (1982).
 - [29] Z. Ficek and R. Tanaś, *Phys. Rep.* **372**, 369 (2002).
 - [30] R. H. Dicke, *Phys. Rev.* **93**, 99 (1954).
 - [31] R. H. Lehman, *Phys. Rev. A* **2**, 883 (1970).
 - [32] For optical wave lengths of 400 – 900 nm and for typical distances r_{12} between the chlorophyll molecules in different LHCS varying from 1 to 10 nm [2, 39], the effective distances $\xi \sim 0.01 - 0.1$.
 - [33] V. May and O. Kühn, *Charge and Energy Transfer Dynamics in Molecular Systems* (Wiley-VCH, Weinheim, 2004).
 - [34] G. V. Varada and G. S. Agarwal, *Phys. Rev. A* **45**, 6721 (1992).
 - [35] T. Scholak *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. E* **83**, 021912 (2011).
 - [36] T. Renger, V. May, and O. Kühn, *Phys. Rep.* **343**, 137 (2001).
 - [37] Z. Ficek, R. Tanas, and S. Keilich, *Opt. Acta* **33**, 1149 (1986).
 - [38] A similar system of equations was studied in the context of spontaneous emission from two non-identical atoms [37].
 - [39] M. Milder, B. Brüggemann, R. van Grondelle, and J. L. Herek, *Photosynth. Res.* **104**, 257 (2010).